III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-23 and 25-28 were presented for examination. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-23 and 25-28 were rejected in the current Office Action. Applicant has herein amended claims 1, 7, 12, 17 and 23 and claims 3, 15, 19 and 25 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter is believed added.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3-17, 19-23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent 5 948 055 to Pulsipher et al in view of US Patent 6 282 175 to Steele et al.

With regard to the 112 rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims which contained the words "specific" and "different" to include "at least a first" and "at least a second" to clarify the claims according to the Office's interpretation of definitive subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Office withdraw this rejection.

With regard to the 35 USC 103(a) rejection, Applicant submits that the cited combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention as currently amended.

For instance, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Pulsipher in view of Steele fails to disclose, *inter alia*, "a collection system for collecting device identification and detail information from devices on the network … wherein at least a first collection tool is configured to collect at least a first subset of the device identification and detail information for at least a first operating system, and at least a second collection tool is configured to collect at least a second subset of the device identification and detail information for at least a second operating system." Rather, the Office posits that although Pulsipher does not teach this feature, it would have been obvious since duplication of parts involves only routine art in the art. The Office further states that this is only nonfunctional language.

In contrast, Applicant asserts that a plurality of collection tools, at least one configured to collect a first subset of information of a first operating system, and at least a second configured to collect a second subset of information of a second operating system, is not simple duplication of parts. It requires different components with different purposes, which all must work together.

Further, although some collection tools are known in the art, the combination of results of these collection tools is an inventive step of the current application. Accordingly, the cited combination also fails to teach or suggest the feature of, *inter alia*, "an analysis system for analyzing the collected device identification and detail information comprising rules for resolving any conflicts between device identification and detail information collected by the plurality of collection tools and configured to resolve conflicts between information for the at least first and second device identification and detail information and the at least first and second operating system." This amendment clarifies for the Office that the plurality of collection tools is not a nonfunctional portion of the claim, but rather that different types of information are

collected by different tools, and the results of the different types of information require the analysis system to "analyze/parse the information to determine the full extent of the network." (Instant application, Page 15 second paragraph).

In contrast, Pulsipher discloses that "[o]nce it is determined that the objects reported by two different stations 100 are in fact the same real world object, the conflict should be resolved." (Pulsipher, Col. 11, Lines 8-10). Applicant asserts that combining two versions detected into a single object, as further described by Pulsipher, or leaving multiple versions, is not the same as collecting different subsets of information from different operating systems and combining this information, further resolving differences from the collection tools with an analysis system.

Thus, Pulsipher in view of Steele does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Further, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office that the plurality of collection tools is obvious in view of Pulsipher and that such an amendment is nonfunctional. Applicant asserts that the arguments given above for independent claim 1 apply similarly to independent claims 7, 12, 17 and 23. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Applicant submits that each of the claims not specifically addressed herein is believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as their own unique features.

With regard to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to independent claims listed above. In addition, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicant will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserves the right to do so should it become necessary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw its rejections.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen F. Swinton Jr./
Stephen F. Swinton Jr.
Reg. No.: 53,661
(ND)

Date: June 30, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)